

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant responds herein to the Office Action dated April 8, 2008.

The Examiner has stated that the title of the invention is not descriptive and has required a new title. In compliance with the requirement, the title has been amended herein.

Claims 1-5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Tomohide et al., (JP07-295720). Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

In regard to independent claim 1, the Examiner contends that Tomohide et al. teaches a mobile information terminal which comprises a display device, a plurality of operation keys disposed on a surface opposite to a surface on which the display surface of the display device is disposed, finger position detecting mechanisms for detecting that a finger of an operator is placed on each of the operation keys, and a control section, (Office Action, page 2, paragraph 2, lines 3-8).

Further, the Examiner asserts that the control section in Tomohide et al. executes a processing operation to cause the display device to display an image showing the arrangement of the operation keys and to change an icon which is included in the image of the arranged operation keys and which corresponds to one of the operation keys on which the operator placed his/her finger when the control section determines, according to an input signal from the finger position detecting mechanisms, that the finger of the operator is placed on the one of the operation keys, (Office Action, page 2, paragraph 2, line 10, to page 3, line 4).

However, it is respectfully submitted that Tomohide et al. fails to describe a mobile information terminal, as claimed in independent claim 1.

Tomohide et al. discloses that both a touch sensor and a keyboard are provided on a mobile information terminal. Tomohide et al. discloses in paragraph [0019], "the touch sensor 8 is arranged so that the surface of the display 1 may be covered, and it detects the pointing operation to the surface of the display 1 with a user's finger and input pen."

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the touch sensor that is disclosed in Tomohide et al. is not a sensor for detecting that a finger of an operator is placed on each of the operation keys, which are disposed on a surface opposite to a display surface, as claimed in independent claim 1.

Since each of claims 2-5 is directly or indirectly dependent upon independent claim 1, each of claims 2-5 is allowable for at least the same reasons recited above with respect to the allowability of independent claim 1.

Claims 7-9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Bogward (20040049743). Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

In regard to independent claim 7, the Examiner states that Bogward teaches a mobile information terminal which comprises a display device and keypads that correspond to a plurality of operation keys disposed on a surface opposite to a surface on which the display surface of the display device is disposed, (Office Action, page 5, lines 1-4).

However, it is respectfully submitted that the keypads in Bogward are not disposed on a surface opposite to a surface on which the display surface of the display device is disposed, as claimed in independent claim 7, but appear to be disposed on a surface on which the display surface of the display device is disposed, (see Fig. 1B).

Further, Bogward appears to fail to disclose “a processing operation to change the assignment of key codes to said operation keys in response to an input signal from said gravity sensor,” as claimed in independent claim 7.

Since claim 8 is indirectly dependent upon independent claim 1, claim 8 is allowable for at least the same reasons recited above with respect to the allowability of independent claim 1.

Since claim 9 is directly dependent upon independent claim 7, claim 9 is allowable for at least the same reasons recited above with respect to the allowability of independent claim 7.

Claim 6 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Tomohide et al., in view of Bogward. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Since claim 6 is directly dependent upon independent claim 1, claim 6 is allowable for at least the same reasons recited above with respect to the allowability of independent claim 1.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, allowance of claims 1-9 is respectfully requested. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider the application, allow the claims as amended and pass this case to issue.

THIS CORRESPONDENCE IS BEING
SUBMITTED ELECTRONICALLY
THROUGH THE UNITED STATES
PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
EFS FILING SYSTEM
ON

Respectfully submitted,


MAX MOSKOWITZ
Registration No.: 30,576
OSTROLENK, FABER, GERB & SOFFEN, LLP
1180 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10036-8403
Telephone: (212) 382-0700